



APPENDIX 1 – Decision Notice

North Shore Wildlife Management Area Management Plan

Montana Fish, Wildlife & Parks

Region 1

490 North Meridian Road

Kalispell, MT 59901

February 15, 2019

Wildlife Management Area Plan

The primary goal for the North Shore Wildlife Management Area (WMA) is to manage seasonal wetlands and agricultural fields to provide resting and refueling habitat for migratory waterfowl during their spring migration. Secondary goals include protecting surface and groundwater resources and promoting habitat for migratory shorebirds, upland game birds, songbirds, and other nongame bird species, and to provide public opportunities for outdoor recreation, primarily in the form of hunting and bird watching. Finally, management of the WMA will strive to utilize agricultural practices that promote long-term soil health to demonstrate the connection between soil health and agricultural productivity, water quality protection, and wildlife habitat.

To assist Montana Fish, Wildlife & Parks (MFWP) in attaining these goals, a draft management plan was created. The management plan identifies objectives and management strategies to be implemented by MFWP staff. The Management plan helps regional staff prioritize funding and manpower. Some actions identified in the plan may require separate analysis and public review, consistent with the Montana Environmental Policy Act.

MFWP proposes to accept the Draft North Shore WMA Management Plan as Final.

Public Involvement

Public comment on the draft management plans was accepted for 38 days from December 19, 2018 through January 25, 2019. During this comment period the draft management plans was available on both the MFWP website and at the Regional office in Kalispell. A press release was issued and news articles regarding the proposal appeared in the Daily Interlake and Flathead Beacon, and Montana Public Radio

covered the draft plan's release. Notifications of the availability of the draft management plan and the opportunity to comment were mailed to neighboring landowners and other interested parties. Based on that input, several changes were made to the plan which are highlighted in the sections below.

Summary of Public Comments

MFWP received comments on the Draft Management Plan from 13 individuals and 4 local conservation groups. Nine comments were wholly supportive and endorsed the plan as written. A tenth letter was supportive of most proposed actions but encouraged elevation of water quality protection as the primary goal and provided additional management recommendations. Two comments were received imploring that the WMA remain pristine and undeveloped. Three comments were received that supported the plan direction, but offered several management recommendations. Comments and MFWP's responses are below.

Public Comment and MFWP Response

Comment 1: MFWP received a comment that the WMA was purchased to protect surface and groundwater water, riparian habitats and benefit fish and wildlife, and that water quality protection, not waterfowl should be the primary management goal.

MFWP Response 1: The North Shore WMA was acquired during a period of rapid development within the Flathead Valley where there has been a steady decline in acres of cropland over the last 30 years. MFWP, along with its partners, recognized that the North Shore, the largest undeveloped stretch of Flathead Lake shoreline, was an important wildlife, scenic, cultural, recreational and agricultural resource. Development would be a significant loss for Montanans, wildlife, and our tourist and agricultural economies. Concerns regarding surface, ground and lake water quality were also paramount.

Acquired in three phases, using diverse funding sources with varied interests, the central driving force for acquisition was that these parcels were too important to lose to development. Water quality concerns were a significant driver, but not an exclusive one, nor one to be managed for at the expense of all other objectives. Parcel protection alone has eliminated the threat of groundwater contamination from septic leachate and increased runoff through cropland conversion to impervious surfaces. In addition, MFWP along with its tenant farmer are implementing several Best Management Practices (BMPs) to further enhance water quality protection, including installing vegetated buffers around existing wetlands, planting woody vegetation within seasonal wetlands, use of no-till agriculture, and amendment schedules based on rigorous soil and nutrient evaluation. Water quality protection is a major management objective, but not the exclusive objective. The WMA is clearly an important staging area for migratory waterfowl and shorebirds, species whose habitat is declining as natural areas are developed and agricultural lands converted to residences. The objectives detailed in this plan aim to achieve not just water quality protection and enhancement, but also to provide for the restoration and enhancement of a mix of plant communities to benefit a variety of wildlife species. Neither objective is exclusive of the other.

Comment 2: MFWP received two comments requesting the plan provide more information about migratory shorebird use of the WMA and how management will benefit these species. Writers noted that migratory shorebirds also utilize flooded fields, migrate later in spring than shorebirds, and benefit from the gradual drawdown of flooded areas that expose mudflats and associated invertebrates. One commenter also references a telemetry study documenting the brief staging of a long-billed curlew in the Valley during April 2018 and a desire that the plan recognize the presence of this species in the Flathead.

MFWP Response 2: MFWP appreciates these comments and agrees the plan could better articulate the importance of the WMA to shorebirds and how management will enhance foraging opportunities for migratory shorebirds so we have made changes to the plan to include shorebirds as a management objective for the property. However, MFWP has no water rights associated with this property and no water source to manage for staging shorebirds or other species. Flood frequency and duration will always be at the vagary of climate and Highway 82 drainage ditch maintenance, which influences flooding on this and neighboring properties and is not under our control. Proposed management recommendations to reduce extent and cover of reed canary grass and garrison creeping foxtail, and to enhance our ability to retain surface flooding, will certainly benefit migrating shorebirds including black-necked stilts, ibis, dunlin, black-bellied plovers, phalaropes and many of the other shorebird species that have been documented foraging in flooded fields on the WMA during spring migration. Plan revisions include better documentation of shorebird use, planned retention of surface-flooding through mid-May to accommodate late-season migrants, as well provisions for gradual drawdown when the opportunity arises.

Comment 3: MFWP received comments suggesting a focus on restoring relic native habitats of the Flathead Region including native grassland and a preference for native forage over introduced species.

MFWP Comment 3: MFWP appreciates the comment. During the planning process MFWP closely examined restoration opportunities. Habitat management recommendations identified in this plan are grounded in what MFWP believes is the site's ecological potential, sustainable over time, and have the greatest habitat benefit. The North Shore WMA has a 100+ year legacy of farming. Soils, save for a few relic conifer stands, have been turned repeatedly. Wetlands have been cleared, plowed, drained, and are dominated by reed canary grass. Highway ditches intercept much of the snowmelt that once flooded the property, and dams and levees have eliminated seasonal floodplain inundation. The ecological processes that created and sustained native plant communities are highly impaired and beyond our capacity to restore. While we agree that these relic habitats of the valley deserve protection and stewardship, the North Shore WMA is not the appropriate place to try and recreate them. Instead, MFWP habitat initiatives on the property aim to replace some of the functions lost when these native habitats were lost – namely the provision of resting and foraging areas for migrating waterfowl and shorebirds, woody and herbaceous upland areas to provide cover and feeding areas for songbirds and upland game, as well as hunting opportunities for the public. Our primary tool will be agriculture and the use of conventional means to maintain a mix of agriculture and cover that will accrue benefits to multiple species. Management will be

responsive to success, adapt overtime, utilize species that are competitive given constraints of invasive weeds and wildlife browse, and expand over time as success and capacity warrant.

Comment 4: MFWP received a comment that prescribed fire should be considered for use given the presence of the fire-adapted ponderosa pine as well as fire's potential benefit to restoring native grassland.

MFWP Response 4: MFWP appreciates the comment and agrees that fire can be an effective management tool. MFWP also recognizes prescribed fire carries potential risks and can be costly to implement. Though not precluded from use, MFWP has not identified any immediate need for its use on the North Shore WMA. Relic stands of ponderosa pine and Douglas fir are small, and fire's absence is not impairing function nor resilience of these habitats. Restoring native grasslands is a herculean undertaking. We have experimented with native grasses on this property and found they were outcompeted by non-native grasses and noxious weeds. This property and the general Flathead Valley are heavily populated by invasive, non-native, sod-forming grasses (e.g. reed canary, quack grass, timothy) as well as numerous species of noxious weeds. Consequently, restoring a native bunchgrass grassland is not a proposed management action, but we will continue to experiment with a mix of native and nonnative grass species that will provide the habitat structure beneficial to a variety of wildlife species.

Comment 5: MFWP received a comment questioning whether plans for conversion of farmland to permeant cover were of sufficient scale to achieve nesting habitat objectives. The writer notes that the current plan calls from an increase in the percentage of dense and more native cover from 15% to 25% of the WMA area, and encourages a target closer to 50%.

MFWP Response 5: FWP has not set a long-term goal for the proportion of the North Shore WMA to remain in cultivation versus converted to native-like habitats and cover. Instead, plan recommendations focus on transforming areas with the greatest wildlife potential first – namely seasonally wet areas, field areas contiguous with existing native habitats, and fields whose layouts make farming a challenge. Our goal is to deliver on these acres first – over 85 acres of conversion and enhancement. Experience has shown this can be a significant undertaking, with weed management a primary concern and impediment to success. FWP will implement an effectiveness monitoring program to inform management and will review plan goals, and make new recommendations based largely on the extent to which we are able to achieve objectives detailed in this plan.

Comment 6: MFWP received a comment questioning how success will be evaluated and recommend MFWP incorporate some degree of monitoring program into the plan along with timelines for periodic review, revision and public feedback.

MFWP Response 6: Effectiveness monitoring will be used to evaluate success of habitat initiatives and management will be responsive to the results. Inclusion of a monitoring framework within the plan is a good recommendation and its absence an oversight. The plan has been revised to include objectives and actions for effectiveness monitoring of hydrology, plantings, weeds, and wildlife. FWP will review plans

and objectives within five years, propose management changes, and solicit public comment through the Environmental Assessment process.

Comment 7: MFWP received two comments inquiring about the stock pond and whether MFWP had considered plans for management.

MFWP Response 7: MFWP considered several options for management of the existing stock, from filling it in, to modifications of pond bathymetry and side-slopes to provide a broader range of habitats for waterfowl and non-game. Given the cost of excavation, the lack of ecological function within excavated ponds, and limited wildlife benefit, MFWP considers pond enhancement a low priority. Under existing conditions, wildlife can access water at the north and south end of the pond where slopes moderate. Active management will focus on planting woody shrubs on the overburden (excavate) that surrounds the pond to enhance cover for non-game species and waterfowl and willows along the margins of the pond.

Comment 8: MFWP received a comment expressing concern that expanding the extent of ponderosa pine on the WMA would provide perch and roost sites for raptors and therefore detract from the plan's primary objective – providing resting and refueling habitat for migratory waterfowl during spring migration, and secondary goal – promoting habitat for upland game birds and songbirds.

MFWP Response 8: Existing conifer stands, both on and adjacent to the WMA, already provide perches and roosts for raptors. Great-horned owls nest on the WMA, bald Eagles nest just south of the property boundary. These relic conifer stands provide habitat and shelter for numerous additional species, from deer and turkey, to several species of migratory songbird. Perpetuating these habitats is important for maintaining habitat diversity on the WMA and should not detract for the WMA's primary goals. Migrating waterfowl congregations always attract predators – they follow their food; perches exist, and although pine extent will expand, the impact will be negligible. Note that waterfowl production – the production of ducklings, is not a WMA habitat management object. FWP recognizes that even with field conversion, there is insufficient cover to support viable duckling production. The site would always be a habitat sink for waterfowl because raptors can easily catch any ducklings that hatch on the small, isolated ponds or the shallows along the north end of Flathead Lake. However, high-quality upland habitat should attract ground-nesting birds including waterfowl, pheasants and some songbirds.

Comment 9: MFWP received a comment opposed to ditch improvements on the WMA given concerns that doing so would accelerate runoff and increase transport of nutrients and highway pollution to the lake. As an alternative, the commenter suggested planting willows and shrubs to enhance wildlife habitat.

MFWP Response 9: Extent and duration of field flooding on the North Shore WMA is largely determined by the volume of spring snowmelt and the condition of the highway drainage network maintained by the Montana Department of Transportation. Maintenance has been infrequent, and today that system drains slowly. Installing a culvert with weir board attachment at the northern boundary of the WMA will accomplish two important objectives. First, the culvert will secure field access for our grower, who currently follows the historic practice of driving equipment across the drainage ditch, leading to ditch

obstructions and increased maintenance. Second, in the event that the frequency of highway ditch maintenance increases, weir boards will enable MFWP to delay field drainage and manage drawdown to benefit migratory waterfowl and shorebirds.

The management plan proposes woody plantings in several locations to enhance wildlife habitat on the WMA. Experience illustrates that success hinges on a dedicated maintenance schedule where the cost of adherence far exceeds the cost of the initial installation. Deer and vole browse are significant hurdles, as is management of noxious weeds. Further complicating plantings is presence of reed canary grass and Garrison creeping foxtail – two species extremely resistant to management and a significant impediment to establishing woody vegetation. Management will be adaptive, and areas slated for naturalization with woody plantings will expand overtime based on success. In the interim, seasonally wet areas outside of those slated for woody plantings will be managed by conventional means to transition those areas away from canary grass and foxtail and towards species more productive for waterfowl and non-game.

Comment 10: MFWP received a comment applauding conversion of many state and federal boundary fences to wildlife friendly fencing and encouraged all fences be converted to wildlife-friendly designs as well as encouraged walk-through designs to facilitate hunter and public access through and across MFWP and USFWS boundaries.

MFWP Response 10: MFWP will work with the USFWS with the goal of making all shared boundary fences wildlife friendly as well as to explore ways to improve public access across boundaries. A management action was added to the plan to this effect.

Comment 11: MFWP received a comment that agricultural practices should transition towards organic for the purposes of water quality protection.

MFWP Response 11: Lease opportunities on the North Shore WMA are competitively bid and the solicitation is strongly weighted to favor bids that propose implementation of Best Management Practices (BMPs), including organic practices, that benefit soil health and water quality. During the last bid cycle, MFWP received several bids and grower interest in installing wetland buffers, no-till agriculture, diverse crop rotations, and amendment prescriptions informed by nutrient testing of soil and crop. Ultimately, MFWP is limited by what the market will bear under this approach to management. When the current lease is up for renewal (2021), MFWP will again structure the bid to strongly favor soil and water quality BMPs including organic practices. However, we believe the current practices and those proposed in this plan will adequately protect water quality and soil health.

Comment 12: MFWP Received a comment expressing concern that the management plan did not adequately articulate the responsibilities of the tenant farmer to control weeds and recommend that means and methods be negotiated and agreed to for control of noxious weeds and reed canary grass.

MFWP Response 12: The lease terms negotiated between MFWP and our tenant farmer detail noxious weed control responsibilities and methods. The tenant farmer is responsible for noxious weed control in

fields, buffer strips and parking areas. All applications must follow herbicide labeling, and within parking areas, the tenant farmer is to use 4 ounces of Milestone Herbicide with 1-pint E99 per acre, or an equally effective herbicide approved by MFWP. Lease performance and annual renewal is contingent, in part, on fulfillment of weed control responsibilities. The plan has been clarified through reference to these negotiated terms. The tenant farmer is not responsible for reed canary grass control.

Comment 13: MFWP received a comment expressing concern about grazing on the property and potential impacts of generic grazing on wildlife, birds, and range condition.

MFWP Response 13: Grazing and mowing are referenced in the plan as potential soil health enhancement tools employed in concert with cover crops. Specifically, grazing can aid cover crop termination and soil reincorporation of nutrients and organic matter. It can also be useful when we need to periodically renovate cover strips. The plan does not suggest a regular grazing regime that might have the potential to harm wildlife habitat values.

Comment 14: MFWP received a comment with two suggestions for improving hunting opportunities and cover – increasing buffer width from 33 ft. to a minimum of 40 ft., and breaking up blocks of leave grain into strips to facilitate simultaneous use by multiple hunting parties.

MFWP Response 14: Integration of wildlife habitat objectives with agricultural production requires solutions that work for both habitat and the producer. Available equipment and operator efficiency are significant considerations. In the case of buffer strips that protect sensitive areas from agricultural runoff and herbicide drift as well serve as travel corridors and shelter for wildlife, the proposed 33-ft width is dictated by the equipment swath. Harvest patterns are dictated by efficiency. We have tried to strike a balance between field size and layout and the efficiency with which fields can be worked, planted, and harvested. As the location of leave areas change each growing season, we will continue to work with our farmer to find practical ways to enhance habitat and hunting opportunities.

Comment 15: MFWP received a comment expressing concern for the plan's emphasis on management for pheasants, an exotic species. The writer encouraged greater emphasis on habitat benefits to native species.

MFWP Response 15: Pheasant, though an exotic species, are an important upland gamebird and MFWP has repeatedly heard the desire from the public for improved hunting opportunities in the valley. Significant funding for WMA acquisition was provided by sportsman through the Pitman-Robertson Act, and MFWP has a responsibility to manage the property to promote game and hunting opportunities. The Plan would be remiss not to provide some focus on habitat improvements for pheasants. Action undertaken to improve cover and forage for pheasant will also benefit native species including songbirds, waterfowl, and deer.

Comment 16: MFWP received a comment appreciative of plan's inclusion of hunting, and recommended inclusion of trapping as well.

MFWP Response 16: Trapping on WMAs, with written permission from the Area Biologist, is permissible, within guidelines of regulations. Trapping opportunities on the North Shore WMA are limited by the size of the property and potential for conflict with domestic dogs that frequently accompany visitors to the property. For this reason, the plan includes no recommendation to manage for, or increase trapping opportunities on the WMA.

Comment 17: MFWP received a comment expressing concern that the goal statement on page four of the plan blends potentially conflicting habitat and recreational goals, and recommends clarifying that public access and recreation be implemented in a manner that is compatible with habitat initiatives.

MFWP Response 17: MFWP recognizes that integration of public access with habitat objectives requires careful consideration, and believes the plan clearly articulates both the precedence placed on wildlife habitat function as well as outlines how public use will be managed and integrated to avoid wildlife disturbance or compromise wildlife objectives. Page 28 of the EA states how we plan to balance these objectives, “As a general objective, public access to the WMA is intended to be as uncomplicated as possible, with the intent of supporting public enjoyment opportunities so long as they do not conflict with FWP rules or the primary purposes (wildlife habitat functions) of the WMA.”

Comment 18: MFWP received comments requesting visitor access and improved wildlife viewing opportunities during the spring closure (March 15 - July 1).

MFWP Response 18: MFWP recognizes the importance of publicly accessible public lands and prioritizes providing access where compatible with wildlife and habitat management objectives. The seasonal closures on the North Shore WMA (March 15-July 1) is in place to prevent disturbance of nesting birds including waterfowl, songbirds and bald eagles, as well as to prevent disturbance of migrating waterfowl and shorebirds utilizing flooded fields and mudflats. As written, the Management Plan recommends liberalization of public access during the spring closure by providing year-round access to the McClarty Home site as well as developing a public viewing area where visitors can observe waterfowl and shorebird congregations without disrupting feeding behavior. Access recommendations were clarified such that year-round access to the McClarty Homesite and planned bird viewing area are explicit.

Comment 19: MFWP received a comment in support of opening the McClarty barn to year-round access so long as there is not property damage and the site is regularly monitored.

MFWP Response 19: MFWP regularly conducts visual patrols of the property during travel along Route 82, but also relies on reports from the public about property condition and undesired activity. There is no permanent staff dedicated to patrolling the property. Lifting the 4.5- month spring closure will provide greater public and MFWP presence during this time. If vandalism becomes an issue, MFWP will have to revisit how public accesses the property and associated structures.

Comment 20: One comment expressed support for a bird viewing area somewhere along the North Shore that provides opportunity to view both the lake and shoreline and FWP lands, but expressed concern that

such a viewing site not significantly impact bird and wildlife use of the area. The author encouraged careful evaluation of potential impacts of a viewing area and its use during the normal spring closure period, recognizing the need to balance public use against meeting wildlife goals of this relatively small area.

MFWP Response 20: MFWP agrees, development of a bird viewing area demands thoughtful consideration of wildlife requirements and means for avoiding wildlife impacts. Improper location, and or inadequate screening of the structure and access routes could create a permanent disturbance that would detract from the WMA's goal of supporting migrating waterfowl. MFWP has examined several potential locations on the WMA that utilize existing infrastructure – roads, buildings, and pathways. All are problematic – either too distant from the objective to achieve substantial viewing opportunity, or too close, even with screening, to prevent disturbance. The proposed location, within the property's southwest corner, provides a balance – it would require development of new access routes, but with screening, could eliminate disturbance while providing unparalleled viewing opportunities. As plans develop, MFWP will collaborate with local wildlife groups such as Flathead Wildlife and Flathead Audubon, as well as coordinate with the US Fish & Wildlife Service WPA to ensure the correct location and screening are selected to achieve success and minimal wildlife disturbance. Ultimately, it may be determined that there is a more suitable location on or off the WMA. Before any observation area is constructed, the final plans will be subject to public review and comment through a separate Environmental Assessment process. The comment also suggested that the barn might be an appropriate viewing site. FWP doesn't think the barn is a good location because it is far from the nearest flooded field. However, opening that area to yearlong public access will provide some limited viewing opportunities for people with good optical equipment during wet years.

Comment 21: One comment requested that we allow hiking trails on the property.

MFWP Response 21: Hiking is allowed on the entire property from July 16 through the end of February, and under this plan would be allowed yearlong at the McClarty home site. The layout of cover and crops described in the plan would create natural routes for people hiking the property. Given that the WMA remains a working landscape and extent of naturalization areas developing, no formalized trail system is proposed at this time.

Comment 22: MFWP received a comment that the plan inadequately addresses the Department of Fish, Wildlife & Parks' responsibility towards Montana Heritage properties as described in the State Antiquities Act, does not explain how the McClarty Barn was evaluated, nor whether ancillary structures and features were considered. The commenter recommends adding management actions "as required by the Montana Antiquities Act, to monitor its [McClarty-Barn] condition and provide for its annual and long-term maintenance."

MFWP Response 22: Recognizing the barn was potentially eligible for historic listing, MFWP requested that the landowner, prior to sale to MFWP, submit a Historic Property Record form to the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO). SHPO reviewed that submission, which detailed the Barn, surrounding structures and farm equipment, and determined that the barn, two windmills, and abandoned farm

equipment were eligible for National Register (NR) listing under Criteria A (event associated with settlement of the area) and Criteria C (architecture). Because of its NR-eligible status, the barn became a State Heritage Property by default when acquired by MFWP, and MFWP is required to include it in its “Senate Bill 3” (SB3) Report on FWP Heritage Properties. Senate Bill 3 was enacted in 2011 and requires biennial reporting of integrity, status, condition, stewardship efforts, and maintenance needs of sites already on or eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP). The most recent SB3 Report, issued February 2018, lists the McClarty-Worm Barn as site 24FH1226, a NRHP-eligible site in good conditions. Reported maintenance priorities and site needs for 2018-2019 reporting period and beyond include: routine maintenance and repairs, discussions on how to manage the site, and site monitoring.

Note that in 1996 MFWP developed and approved Administrative Rules to comply with the Montana State Antiquities Act. These ARM rules are referenced as ARM 12.8.501 to 12.8.510. MFWP’s Heritage Resources Program Manager coordinates compliance efforts and functions as a resource to field staff to ensure protection of historic resources under MFWP stewardship.

The preservation of heritage resources on WMA’s is a priority, but work is funding dependent. MFWP is in compliance with the Montana State Antiquities Act.

Comment 23: MFWP received several comments along the theme that the WMA should be kept natural and pristine and that no construction be permitted. Absent additional information regarding how comment authors define “natural and pristine”, MFWP interprets these comments to signify the authors’ general desire that the WMA remain much as it is today – a pastoral landscape with active agriculture. The tenor of these comments was disparaging towards the trend of subdivision and development along the North Shore Highway 82 corridor.

MFWP Response 23: Management recommendations call for continued cultivation of annual grains, naturalization of certain areas to provide wetland buffers and wildlife cover, and construction of a public bird viewing area. The WMA will look and feel much as it has for the past several decades. The construction referenced by this comment is not on the WMA. If MFWP proposes future construction, including that of a bird viewing area, a separate process and opportunity for public comment will be held.

Comment 24: MFWP received several comments from local wildlife, resource, and advocacy groups encouraging partnership and expressing desire to collaborate with MFWP on plan implementation and assessment, as well as help with public access and education initiatives.


MFWP Response 24: Partnerships are vital to our success. MFWP looks forward to working together and will reach out to local wildlife and advocacy groups to develop opportunities for meaningful collaboration (see recommended action on page 27). MFWP also encourages continued dialog with all interested parties. Feedback is always welcome, and even after plan adoption, MFWP is open to discussions, critique, and recommendations from the public on ways to improve stewardship.

Comment 25: MFWP received several comments wholly supportive of the draft plan as written and endorsed the draft plan as written.

MFWP Response 25: MFWP appreciates all comments received on this draft management plan. We are thrilled the plan has been met with much enthusiasm. We are excited to commence with the plan's implementation and believe the North Shore WMA will shine as a result. MFWP is also grateful for the handful of comments that were more critical of proposed actions. These comments highlighted plan omissions, inconstancies, and ambiguities. The final plan and resource benefited from the public's involvement.

MFWP FINAL DECISION

After reviewing this management plan and the public comments received, it is MFWP's decision to approve the North Shore WMA Management Plan as modified through this public review process as final. MFWP believes the completion of this plan will help the department manage and enhance wildlife, water, and soil resources for the benefit of wildlife and water quality and provide recreation opportunities for the public and appreciates the public input that helped improve the plan.


James Williams
Regional Supervisor

3/14/19
Date


Ken McDonald

3/14/2019
Date

Wildlife Administrator